

Docket 61784
Serial No. 10/800,248

PATENT APPLICATION

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUN 14 2007

REMARKS

This is in full and timely response to the Office Action on the merits dated April 6, 2006. Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing
5 amendments and the following remarks.

By the foregoing amendment, claims 1-12, 14-15, and 19-20 stand previously canceled and claim 13 has again been amended. Therefore, claims 13 and 16-18 remain in this application with claim 13 being independent. Claim 13 has been amended according to implicit suggestions by the examiner as to minor distinctions over the prior art such that the claims should now be in
10 condition for allowance without any significant examination effort.

IN THE CLAIMS:35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections:

15 Claims 13 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chipperfield (U.S. Pat. No. 5,855,359) in view of Haulotte (U.S. Pat. No. 4,343,379) and Coates (U.S. Pat. No. 4,558,847).. Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chipperfield in view of Haulotte and Coates and further in view of Watkins (U.S. Pat. No. 6,679,479).

20 In addressing the applicant's previous amendment and arguments, the examiner appears to indicate that claim 13 fails to distinguish over Chipperfield in that "[t]he applicant has not disclosed the rollers being in "direct" contact with the tires." The applicant respectfully

Docket 61784
Serial No. 10/800,248

PATENT APPLICATION

disagrees. First, Fig. 1 clearly discloses a tire in direct contact with rollers (126). This drawing figure is very clear and should be considered as part of the originally submitted specification. Second, amended claim 13 recites that the pair of rollers allows a tire to "rotate thereon." The applicant urges that the normal reading of the word "thereon" at least implies direct physical
5 contact. Certainly in conjunction with Figs. 1 and 2 and the clear reference numerals, the applicant urges that the exact meaning and scope of the claim language is definite and clear.

Further, the examiner states that claim 13 does not recite that the ramps are in direct contact with the base and thus does not distinguish over Chipperfield. Again, the applicant disagrees in that claim 13 recites that the pair of ramps is mounted to respective sides of the base.
10 The specification clearly defines that the opposed sides 112 are merely positions along the base itself (Application, p 5, line 5, p. 6, lines 1-3, and Figs. 1-2) and are not upwardly extending structures, as the examiner is equating with Chipperfield. In other words, the "sides" are portions of the base itself. There is no "indirect mounting" as in Chipperfield (Chipperfield teaches that the ramps are only "indirectly" mounted to the base with pivoting arms situated therebetween).

15 Without admitting the propriety of the current rejections on this point for all of the reasons given above, claim 13 has been further amended to more perfectly recite the narrow distinctions made by the examiner. More particularly, claim 13 has been amended to explicitly recite that a tire and wheel rotate on the rollers in direct contact therewith. As this is clearly shown in Fig. 1, disclosed in the original specification, and the applicant believes already recited in claim 13, no
20 further searching or consideration would be needed in order to move this application to allowance. Further, this amendment should also be entered as it merely incorporates a suggestion made by the examiner in the final office action.


Docket 61784
Serial No. 10/800,248

PATENT APPLICATION

Claim 13 has been further amended to more explicitly recite that the pair of ramp members are situated upon said base. Again, the applicant believes that this configuration is already apparent based on the original specification, drawings, and original claim language. No further searching or consideration would appear necessary to enter this amendment and consider claim 5 13 to be in condition for allowance. Again, the amendment of claim 13 merely incorporates the specific comment by the examiner regarding the specific deficiency in the claim language. By making this claim amendment and pointing out how this amendment is supported by the original disclosure (see above), claim 13 should now be in condition for allowance.

If the examiner has any suggestions that would place this application in even better 10 condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to contact the applicant's representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully Submitted,


Dale J. Ream
Patent Reg. No. 45,798

Date: June 29, 2006

HARSHAW RESEARCH, INC.
Lawyer's Building
2nd & Main
P.O. Box 418
Telephone (785) 242-9500
Facsimile (785) 242-3308